

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-15 have been amended. Claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS 1 AND 2

On page 2, items 1 and 2, of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of informalities.

Claim 1 is amended herein to delete the word "an" in line 9. Claim 2 is amended herein to delete the word "step" in line 2. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objections are overcome and/or rendered moot.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 5-15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MARSH ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,208,799)

The rejections of claims 1, 2 and 5-15 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14

Amended claim 1, for example, recites sending a message via email to a mobile communication terminal of the user and altering the control information based on the alteration information, in response to permission sent from the mobile communication terminal of the user.

In Marsh et al. (hereinafter "Marsh"), future-time VCR recording of a program is requested based on an Interactive-Program-Guide (IPG) that is transmitted from the headend. If the cable systems program schedule is subsequently changed, the headend provides an updated IPG. The set-top compares an updated IPG with the programmed VCR recording data and performs rescheduling to correct the programmed VCR recording data if a discrepancy is found.

In column 12, lines 4-9, Marsh teaches providing a user-alert-message on a TV display that informs the user of a time-slot conflict that may arise as a result of the automatic rescheduling of a VCR recording (See also Fig. 8). Marsh merely discloses providing a

message on the apparatus (TV) that is directly connected to the controlled apparatus (VCR). Marsh neither teaches nor suggests sending a message via email to a mobile communication terminal of the user and obtaining permission sent from the mobile communication terminal of the user.

Thus, Marsh does not disclose all of the features recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference.

The foregoing arguments are directed to claim 1; however, amended independent claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 recite sending a message via email to a mobile communication terminal of the user and altering the control information based on the alteration information, in response to permission sent from the mobile communication terminal of the user.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 patentably distinguish over the reference.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15

Amended independent claim 5, for example, recites controlling a remote control object via a network from the control information management server in accordance with the control information based on a check result of the control condition. The control information management server checks the control condition contained in the control information, and controls the object via a network in accordance with the control information.

In Marsh, on the other hand, the set top checks the control condition contained in the IPG and controls the VCR. The headend merely transmits an IPG.

Therefore, Marsh neither teaches nor suggests the features of amended claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the reference.

The foregoing arguments are directed to amended claim 5; however, amended independent claims 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 recite controlling a remote control object via a network from the control information management server in accordance with the control information based on a check result of the control condition.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 patentably distinguish over the reference.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 3 AND 4 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS
BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MARSH

The rejections of claims 3 and 4 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from amended claim 1 and inherit its patentable recitations. As argued above, Marsh neither teaches nor suggests sending a message via email to a mobile communication terminal of the user and altering the control information based on the alteration information, in response to permission sent from the mobile communication terminal of the user, as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 4 patentably distinguish over the reference.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 20, 2005

By: David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501